REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 14-19 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 7, and 14 to clarify the features set forth therein. In addition, Applicant amends claims 4 and 6 for conformity therewith and cancels claim 5 without prejudice or disclaimer.

The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1-11 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crow et al. (US 2002/0161915 A1), hereinafter referred to as "Crow", in view of Ganesan et al. (US 2003/0069973 A1), hereinafter referred to as "Ganesan", and further in view of Varma et al. (US 2004/0037302 A1), hereinafter referred to as "Varma", and further in view of Rana et al. (US 2002/0095512 A1), hereinafter referred to as "Rana". Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crow, in view of Ganesan, and further in view of Varma, and further in view of Rana, and further in view of Hui et al. (US 2004/0151197 A1), hereinafter referred to as "Hui". Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection at least in view of the following exemplary comments.

Of these rejected claims, only claims 1, 7, and 14 are independent. Independent claim 1 *inter alia* recites: if a received packet is a fragmented packet, determining whether the received packet is a first fragment packet; if the received packet is the first fragment packet, looking-up a tunnel ID of the received packet and a fragment ID of the received packet, and comparing the result of the looked-up fragment ID with each list in a fragment look-up table into which the results of fragment look-ups for other received packets are entered, to determine if there is a corresponding list; searching an index indicating one of the protocol processors and corresponding to the tunnel ID of the received packet from a tunnel ID look-up table, and if the list corresponding to the result of the looked-up fragment ID exists in the fragment look-up table,

entering the index into the corresponding list of the fragment look-up table; and attaching the

index as a tag to the received packet and transmitting the received packet to the corresponding

one of the protocol processors, wherein if list of a fragment look-up table is not accessed during

a predetermined time, the list is removed from a fragment look-up table, wherein if the received

packet is not the first fragment, looking-up the fragment ID of the received packet and

comparing the result of the looked-up fragment ID with each list in the fragment look-up table,

to determine if there is a corresponding list; and wherein if the list corresponding to the result of

the looked-up fragment ID exists in the fragment look-up table, determining whether the index

corresponding to the result of the tunnel ID look-up exists in the corresponding list; and

attaching the index as the tag to the received packet and transmitting the received packet to the

corresponding one of the plurality of protocol processors, if the index exists in the corresponding

list.

The Examiner appears to acknowledge that Crow does not disclose or suggest

determining whether the index corresponding to the result of the tunnel ID look-up exists in the

corresponding list, as set forth in independent claim 1 but alleges that Ganesan cures this

deficiency (see page 12 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Ganesan fails to disclose having the index corresponding to the result of the tunnel ID

look-up. That is, "the index corresponding to the result of the tunnel ID look-up" as set forth in

claim 1 does not correspond to "the tunnel ID of the packet" described in Ganesan. In other

words, Ganesan does not disclose or suggest that if the received packet is not the first fragment,

it is determined whether the index corresponding to the result of the tunnel ID look-up exists in

the corresponding list. Ganesan does not disclose or suggest that the tunnel ID is included only

when the received packet is the first fragment and that the tunnel ID is not known for subsequent

packets. Ganesan does not disclose or even remotely suggest determining whether the list corresponding to the result of the looked-up fragment ID instead of the tunnel ID exists in the fragment look-up table. In short, Ganesan does not disclose or suggest that the tunnel ID can be used only when the received packet is the first fragment and not one of the subsequent fragments.

Varma and Rana do not cure this deficiency of Crow and Ganesan. For at least these exemplary reasons, Crow in view of Ganesan, Varma, and Rana do not disclose or suggest the unique features of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-4, 6, 18, and 19.

Next, independent claims 7 and 14 recite features similar to, although not necessarily coextensive with, the features argued above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, arguments presented with respect to claim 1 are respectfully submitted to apply with equal force here. For at least substantially analogous exemplary reasons, therefore, independent claims 7 and 14 are patentable over Crow in view of Ganesan, Varma, and Rana. Claims 8-11, 15, 16, 18, and 19 depend on claims 7 and 14 and are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 17 depends on claim 1. Applicant has already demonstrated that Crow, Ganesan, Varma, and Rana does not meet all the requirements of independent claim 1. Hui is relied upon only for its disclosure of setting an index to invalid and does not compensate for the above-identified deficiencies of Crow, Ganesan, Varma, and Rana. Together, the combined teachings of these references would not have (and could not have) led the artisan of ordinary skill to have achieved the subject matter of claim 1. Since claim 17 depends on claim 1, it is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 5, 2009